

Appln. No.: 09/556,865
Response dated March 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of December 2, 2004, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. The claims are included for the examiner's convenience. No amendments to the claims have been made. Claims 1-3, 9-13, 18-27, and 30-35 thus remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 9, 12, 13, 18-27, 30, 31, 34, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by LaStrange *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,784,058, hereinafter LaStrange). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "displaying a first document context which is the subject of a single navigational focus; displaying a second document context simultaneously with the first document context while maintaining the single navigational focus." To show these features of claim 1, the action relies on FIG. 5 and col. 5, lines 25-45. Contrary to the action's assertion however, LaStrange does not teach or suggest a single navigational focus as claimed. Rather LaStrange describes a multi-space navigational environment, which applicants have distinguished in the Background of Invention section of the specification.

In a multi-space navigational environment each display context is provided with its own set of navigational controls. In a user interface without a single navigational focus, there may be a multiplicity of navigational controls on the screen, some which affect one frame, some which affect another, and possibly some that affect navigation between different frames. Specification as filed at p. 1, line 14 – p. 2, line 12. A page-oriented architecture, such as is used in web browsing, does not permit simultaneous viewing of multiple contexts of electronic documents without creating a multi-navigational focus architecture, i.e., using multiple windows, each with their own set of navigational controls. Specification as filed at p. 2, line 13 – p. 3, line 9.

Claim 1 recites that first and second document contexts are simultaneously displayed while maintaining a single navigational focus. LaStrange, on the other hand, does not maintain a single navigational focus when simultaneously displaying multiple contexts. The Office Action even

Appln. No.: 09/556,865
Response dated March 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

concedes this point, then proceeds to ignore it altogether. Office Action, p. 2, last paragraph ("This second page causes a *shift in the navigational focus* to the second document") (emphasis added). Indeed, when opening a new document context, LaStrange behaves just as described in the Background of Invention section of Applicant's specification, creating a separate window having its own navigational controls. LaStrange, FIG. 5, col. 4, lines 28-36. It is readily apparent in FIG. 5 of LaStrange that each browser window 40 has its own set of navigational controls independent of the other browser window. Thus, LaStrange does not use a single navigational focus. Thus, claim 1 is allowable because LaStrange does not teach or suggest a single navigational focus.

Dependent claims 2-3 and 30-31 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. For example, with respect to claim 2, LaStrange does not teach or suggest that the first and second document contexts are non-contiguous parts of the same electronic document. The Office Action also concedes this point, and again ignores the omission altogether. Office Action, p. 3, lines 5-6 ("The user selectively retains the display of the *first web page* while simultaneously viewing the contents of the *second web page*.") (emphasis added). LaStrange does not teach or suggest that the first and second web pages are non-contiguous parts of the same electronic document.

Independent claim 9 recites, similar to claim 1, "displaying a first document context which is the subject of a single navigational focus; displaying a second document context simultaneously with the first document context while maintaining the single navigational focus." Claim 9 is thus allowable for similar reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claims 12 and 13 are dependent on claim 11. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over LaStrange and Fagioli, whereas claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by LaStrange. The rejection of claims 12 and 13 as anticipated by a single reference is improper, given the combination of references required to allegedly reject parent claim 11.

Appln. No.: 09/556,865
Response dated March 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

Claims 18 and 19, similar to claim 1, recites "displaying a first document context which is the subject of a single navigational focus; displaying a second document context simultaneously with the first document context while maintaining the single navigational focus." Claims 18 and 19 are thus allowable for similar reasons as claim 1.

Claim 20, similar to claim 1, recites "displaying a first document context which is the subject of a single navigational focus;...in response to the page pinning signal, displaying at least a portion of the first context as a pinned page overlayed on the first context while maintaining the single navigational focus;...displaying a second document context within the single navigational focus." As discussed with respect to claim 1, LaStrange does not teach or suggest a single navigational focus as claimed. Nor does LaStrange teach or suggest overlaying a pinned page on the first context while maintaining the single navigational focus, and claim 20 is therefore also allowable for this additional reason.

Dependent claims 21-27 and 34-35 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20, as well as based on the additional features recited therein. For example, with respect to claim 21, as with claim 2, LaStrange does not teach or suggest that the first and second document contexts are non-contiguous parts of the same electronic document.

With respect to claim 24, LaStrange does not teach or suggest "displaying a document comprising at least one command in response to a command document display signal input by a user." The Office Action cites LaStrange, col. 5, lines 33-36 as teaching this feature. However, this portion of LaStrange merely indicates that each window in the multi-window navigational structure has a page pinning feature. This is not the same as displaying a document comprising at least one command in response to a command document display signal input by a user as recited in claim 24. Indeed, LaStrange does not teach or suggest the use of a command document display signal.

With respect to claim 26, LaStrange does not teach or suggest that the page pinning signal is initiated automatically in response to the input of the command document display signal. Instead, LaStrange describes loading a web page by overriding the currently displayed

Appln. No.: 09/556,865
Response dated March 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

web page, which is not the same as page pinning being automatically initiated in response to the input of the command document display signal as recited in claim 26.

With respect to claim 27, LaStrange does not teach or suggest selecting a region in the first document context in which a command is to be performed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10, 11, 32, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaStrange in view of Fagioli (U.S. Pat. No. 6,710,790). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 10 and 11, similar to claim 1, recites "displaying a first document context which is the subject of a single navigational focus; and displaying a second document context simultaneously with the first document context while maintaining the single navigational focus." Claim 10 is therefore allowable for similar reasons as claim 1, because Fagioli does not correct the deficiencies of LaStrange.

Claims 32 and 33 are allowable for at least the same reasons as base claim 11, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. Applicants also note that claims 12 and 13, which depend from claim 11, though not rejected over the combination of LaStrange and Fagioli, would be allowable for the same reasons as claim 11 over this combination, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION AND SIGNATURE BLOCK FOLLOW ON NEXT PAGE

Appln. No.: 09/556,865
Response dated March 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 2 day of March, 2005

By: /Ross Dannenberg/
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001
RAD/mmd